

Minutes
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE
February 22, 2005 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.
Group Decision Support Center, Pennino Building

Members Present: Joyce Bissonette, Marilyn Blois, Clark Tyler, Sheila Roit, Joann McCoy, William Lecos, Jim Langemeier, Joan Carr, John Hasel, Joyce Doughty, Conrad Mehan, Queenie Cox, Phil Auld, Paul Liberty

Member Absent: Robin Smyers

Facilitator: JR Holt, JRH Associates, Eric Williams

Guests: Larry Edwards, Rick Galliher, 2 Champion Services representatives

County staff: Jeff Smithberger, Catherine Lunsford, Marilyn McHugh, Linda Boone, Deborah Wisoff

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:03, when a quorum was present.
The minutes of the January 25, 2005 meeting were approved as presented.

Overview of GDSC

The Facilitator explained the process for using the editing function in GroupSystems. She has added line numbers to match the line numbers in the Word draft of the SWTF Report. She again reviewed using the GDSC, the Ground rules and Roberts Rules as modified. The final report from GroupSystems will be attached to the minutes of the meeting.

The task force will allow visitors and staff to make comments to the draft report.

The Chairman suggested that the report may not be finalized in the same order that it is now or as the task force did its work. The final editing may change the order of chapters.

Customer Service Standards

The task force reviewed the customer service standards that had been developed by the residential waste collectors, county staff, and members of the task force over the past two months. The final version resulted from a meeting hosted by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce on February 9 when nine of the collection companies, who collect most residential waste in the county, met, revised and approved the standards and narrative. The task force agreed to insert the standards in the final report as appropriate.

A discussion followed about how to include the customer service standards in the report. The narrative could be inserted in the report as part of the introduction to the Customer Service chapter, with the Standards included in the Appendix.

Ms. McCoy indicated that Champion Services and other collectors may not subscribe to the standards. American Disposal Services, AAA, Reston Trash, Con-Serv Industries, Potomac Disposal Services, and others have indicated they will adopt the standards. Companies that subscribe to the Standards will be identified on the county's webpage.

Questions were discussed about the meaning of various standards, such as "diligently address your issue within one business day." According to the collectors, diligently address means to contact the customer and begin resolution of the concern, not necessarily that the issue will be completely resolved within one business day.

It was suggested that words be added to the introduction that are similar to: “Critical elements in delivering good customer service are good communication between their customers coupled with a commitment from the collectors to meet or exceed their obligations. All solid waste...”

Ms. McCoy asked that her company Champion Services be removed from the list of subscribers to the standards.

Ms. McCoy moved the insertion of the Standards as an Attachment and included narrative language changes at line 355. It was seconded by Ms. Bissonette and adopted unanimously.

Review of Customer Service Chapter

Line 448 – Mr. Liberty moved to change the word “ones” to “matters”. Seconded by Ms. Roit and approved unanimously.

Line 459 - Mr. Liberty moved to delete the word “generally,” seconded by Mr. Lecos and approved unanimously.

Line 461 - Mr. Liberty moved to delete last sentence beginning with “Generally,...” Ms. Roit seconded and the motion was approved.

Line 469 - Mr. Liberty moved to delete the words “want to” from the sentence and it was seconded by Ms. Roit, passing unanimously.

Line 485 - A motion by Ms. McCoy to change “24” to “48 hours” was seconded by Ms. Carr. Votes of 1 Yes 1 Abstaining were recorded, then Ms. McCoy withdrew the original motion following discussion.

Ms. Doughty moved to replace the word “need” with “desire.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Mehan and approved to read, “Customers desire to have...”

Line 511- A motion from Ms. McCoy was seconded by Mr. Hasle to change the line to read “...or provide automated answering services.” It passed unanimously.

Line 524 – Mr. Liberty moved to remove the words “in very close votes”. Ms. Roit seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Line 538 - Ms. McCoy moved to clarify whether the recommendation was to provide dedicated telephone service for customers to report missed collections. It was seconded but Ms. McCoy withdrew the motion. Ms. Roit moved to delete the recommendation since it is already a Fairfax County Code requirement to have a phone line. The motion was seconded by Mr. Langemeier and passed unanimously.

Line 551 – Ms. McCoy moved the sentence be deleted that begins with “County residents have....” Ms. Carr seconded the motion, but it failed on a vote of 2 Yes 12 No.

The task force discussed competition among collection companies and the free market system. While members want to ensure that all residents have access to collection services, the task force believes the free market system will motivate collection companies to expand and offer services to areas that may be underserved. One of the things that sustains competition is that the county owns, manages and operates the disposal facilities.

Line 555 - Mr. Lecos moved to add language before line 555 that states the task force recognizes the county’s continuing role as the manager of disposal facilities as one of the factors that contributes to competition in the county. The task force recommends the county

role in the future solid waste system be to continue to own and operate these disposal facilities. Ms. Carr seconded the motion and it passed on a vote of 1 No, 12 Yes, 1 abstaining.

Following more discussion, the task force agreed there was no need to have a recommendation to retain the status quo. The fact that the task force researched and discussed these topics can be covered in the introduction to the chapter. The fact that the task force chose then to not make additional recommendations will be stated one time, not as part of each topic.

Line 555 – Mr. Lecos moved and Ms. Roit seconded a change to put a period after website and not include the remaining information here. The information will be relocated to the Communication chapter. The motion was unanimously approved.

Line 560 – Mr. Lecos moved to delete the current words. It was seconded by Ms. Roit and passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Ms. Roit and seconded Ms. Doughty to change the wording to read, “The Task Force reviewed many options for solid waste collection within the county, including the option of the county assuming responsibility for contracting for all services for county residents. After lengthy discussions, it was determined that the current free market system with competition among haulers, provides residents with the best prospect for having multiple options for collection services.” The motion passed with 2 No and 12 Yes votes.

Ms. McCoy moved and Ms. Carr seconded to add the words, “This option was rejected by the Task Force.” The discussion centered on the importance of the task force going on record as rejecting the option. An additional friendly amendment was added to change the wording to , “which was rejected by the task force.” This motion passed.

In a further motion, Mr. Lecos moved and Ms. McCoy seconded to change the sentence to read, “The task force discussed at length the option of the county assuming responsibility for contracting services for all county residents. This option was rejected by the task force. Additional recommendations will not ensure that all residents have access to all service options or all companies serving Fairfax County, but Competition should encourage collectors to move into areas where business opportunities arise.” This wording was approved.

Ms. Doughty moved to change the wording to read “...services for all county residents, which was rejected by the task force. Additional recommendations will not ensure that all residents have access to all service options or all companies serving Fairfax County, but competition should encourage collectors to move into areas where business opportunities arise.” Ms Roit seconded. During discussion, a friendly amendment by Ms. McCoy was made to remove the period and change to read, “which was rejected by the task force. The motion passed by a vote of 3 No and 11 Yes.

NOTE: Editors please review language.

Style and format for the report. Delete the recommendations from the report that are essentially “no recommendations”. The discussion of the research and process that the task force completed will be addressed for each topic. However, one comment will be made in the introduction about those topics that have no recommendations beyond supporting the status quo.

Line 573 – Mr. Tyler moved to change the words “there should be no recommendation,” to read “it was not appropriate to...”. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lecos and approved unanimously.

Line 579, Recommendation C4-1 - Ms. Doughty moved and Ms. Bissonette seconded to remove this recommendation. It was approved unanimously.

Line 582 – Mr. Mehan moved and Mr. Lecos seconded to add another paragraph describing yard waste and brush as different types of waste and clarifying the differences. Brush is a separate service from yard waste. Currently, brush is included in the definition of yard waste in the Code. It was suggested that a more thorough discussion and presentation of the language for this topic needed to be completed and could not be done during this meeting. Mr. Mehan withdrew his motion to allow the topic to be moved to the parking lot.

NOTE: The writing/review team for the report was asked to work with Mr. Mehan and Mr. Hasle to draft language about brush and yard waste to be included in the report.

Line 593 – Mr. Liberty moved to delete wording in this sentence, but his motion was included in the deferral to the parking lot.

Line 607 – Mr. Liberty asked that the words “in very close votes,” be removed to remain consistent with earlier administrative change to the report.

Line 614, Recommendation C-5-1 – Mr. Lecos moved and Mr. Liberty seconded a change to the recommendation to read, “Change Chapter 109 to clearly distinguish brush from yard waste....”

Line 630 – Mr. Liberty moved and Mr. Auld seconded to rewrite this section since it has been overcome by the event of the collectors meeting on February 9. The motion passed unanimously. The task force wants to change its recommendation.

Line 634- Ms. Doughty and Mr. Liberty seconded the motion to delete the 2 sentences beginning the “Most members” and ending with “amount of the increase.” Replace the sentences with “The task force recommends that collection companies provide notice of a rate increase 30 days prior too implementing it, such notice to include the amount of the increase.” The motion was approved.

Line 637 - Mr. Liberty moved and Mr. Auld seconded to remove the word "However" and in Line 638 change the phrase "did not feel strongly enough about this issue to require that" to read "determined that no change to" and in line 639 edit "changed" to read "was necessary." The motion passed.

Line 643 – Ms. Roit moved and Ms. McCoy seconded that the recommendation be changed to read, “The TF recommends that the code be changed to require collection companies, to include the amount when providing notice of rate increase 30 days prior to implementing it.” The motion passed unanimously.

Line 648 – Mr. Liberty moved and Mr. Mehan seconded to change the title to read “Safety issues (traffic congestion, unsafe driving on streets) (C-7).” The motion passed unanimously.

Line 653 - Ms. Cox also moved to change the language about the topic being outside the scope of the task force. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Line 660, Recommendation C-7-1- Ms. Roit moved and Ms. Bissonette seconded to remove the recommendation. It was approved unanimously.

Line 665 – Mr. Liberty suggested an administrative change to replace the words "became convinced" with "determined".

Lines 673 – Ms. Roit moved and Ms. Bissonette seconded to remove lines 673-678. No recommendation is needed about maintaining the status quo.

Lines 681-696 – Mr. Tyler moved and Mr. Lecos seconded the motion to move this topic to the Communications chapter since it is a communication issues. The motion to move to a newly created chapter on Communications was approved unanimously.

Line 698-701 – Ms. Doughty's motion was seconded by Ms. Carr to delete this recommendation and it was approved unanimously.

Line 735 - Ms. Doughty suggested that lines 735 to 742 be moved to the beginning of the topic and other words be added such as, "It is the consensus of the task force that the county plays a critical role in the delivery of services during emergencies. " Also the report should offer that there are other services involved in emergencies beyond solid waste, such as hazardous materials. Other thoughts to include in this discussion are:

- The overarching role of county in solid waste management during next 20 years.
- Coordinator for debris management.
- The county's role should be strengthened in coordinating cleanup services.

Move line 735 through 742 earlier in the paragraph.

Further discussion of this topic was deferred and sent to the parking lot.

Line 762 – Mr. Mehan suggested that administrative change be made to the last line, "The county should assist the general public by providing information about haulers' "Quality Customer Service Standards". The county should make user friendly enhancement to its website to further educate the public as to the services it provides.

Line 766 – Mr. Liberty offered two editorial changes, to substitute "The task force agreed" for "It is the desire" and insert "should" between the words "issues" and "be".

Line 773 – Mr. Mehan suggested this topic be moved to the Communications chapter and that the following sentence be considered, "The County should assist the general public by providing information about haulers' 'Quality Customer Service Standards. The County should make user friendly enhancements to its website to further educate the public as to the services it provides. Such changes could include adding a separate subject heading titled "Trash & Recycling". The Solid Waste division's web page should be changed to include a link to:

1. Customer Service Standards
2. Websites of those haulers who request to be linked to the County site.

Line 775 – Ms. Roit moved and Ms. Blois seconded the removal of the recommendation. The motion was approved unanimously.

Line 777 – Communications will become a separate chapter.

Line 781-789 Mr. Liberty suggested changes to be made during the rewriting of the Communications chapter.

- Line 781 add words "and the county and collectors" between words "collectors" and "and"
- Line 782 delete "or a misunderstanding of expectations"
- Line 784 insert "establishing expectations and" between words "in" and "resolving".
- Line 789 insert words "models for" between words "several" and "good"

Lines 814-815 – Mr. Liberty suggested editorial changes to delete the words " Whatever it is named..." and in line 815 substitute the word "subscribe" to "agree".

Line 822 – Ms. Bissonette moved and Mr. Liberty seconded to delete 822-829 entirely. After discussion, she withdrew her motion.

Ms. Roit moved and Mr. Liberty seconded a change to read, “A subcommittee of the task force met with collection companies...” This motion was approved.

Closing matters

The task force determined that another meeting was necessary to fully discuss Communication and Strategy for Emergencies (yard waste and brush issues). The task force agreed that a separate chapter was needed to discuss Communication. The writing/review team will develop the Communication chapter and prepare a discussion of the brush and yard waste section for the March 15 meeting.

Notice was given that Mr. Auld and Ms. McCoy cannot attend the March 15 meeting at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Tyler asked that members consider his proposal for changes to organization of the report. Mr. Hasle will expand his yard waste comments that were provided to members today. The task force will work with the current organization of the report (with added chapter for Communication and brush discussion revisions) for its discussions on March 15.

The meeting adjourned at 10:03.

NEXT MEETING: March 15, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at the Group Decision Support Center

**SOLID WASTE TASK FORCE REPORT FROM MEETING
ON FEBRUARY 22, 2005**

Tuesday, February 22, 2005

Agenda	9
ROLES AND GROUND RULES.....	10
OTHER ITEMS.....	13
SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF FEBRUARY 22ND	14

Agenda - SWMTF Report - End of Feb 22 2005 Meeting

2/22/2005

7:00 PM WELCOME, TASK FORCE BUSINESS

William Lecos, Chairman

JR Holt, Group Facilitator

7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES

7:30 PM OTHER ITEMS

Report from haulers

7:40 PM SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF FEBRUARY 22, 2005

9:20 PM ADJOURN MEETING

See you on March 15th.

ROLES AND GROUND RULES

MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

PURPOSE:

-- Use modified Robert's Rules of Order and collaborative technology to edit the draft final report.

SCOPE:

-- Chapter 3 CUSTOMER SERVICE

MEETING OBJECTIVE:

-- Edit and approve Chapter 3 of the Report

SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!

CHAIRMAN

-- Participate as Task Force member

-- Officiate over voting results

-- Oversee meeting

PARTICIPANTS

Responsible for CONTENT

PARTICIPATE actively

REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate

YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

FACILITATION TEAM

Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)

Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION

Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS

Maintains meeting PACE

Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES

Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.

STARTS and STOPS participants in the software

CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges

Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

GROUND RULES

NEW: Use ROBERTS RULES of Order to work through "annotations"

USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions

CHANGE: The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION." This evening we are asking Task Force Members to identify yourself so that we can keep accurate minutes of motions made and seconded.

Be COURTEOUS

Do not INTERRUPT

Stay FOCUSED on the Task Force interests.

Look beyond the "BOTTOM LINE" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.

Keep MOVING FORWARD -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.

Don't get your feelings HURT.

CHANGED: Appointed Task Force MEMBERS will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed.

-- This evening we are asking Task Force members to identify yourself so that we can keep accurate minutes of motions made and seconded.

If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "PARKING LOT" -- but very sparingly.

CONSENSUS

Everyone has INPUT

Have a GENERAL UNDERSTANDING of ideas and discussions

Select the group's PREFERRED course of action

Usually NOT unanimous or complete agreement

MODIFIED ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER: Instructions and practice session

The Six Steps to Every Motion:

STEP 1. A member stands up, is recognized, and makes a motion;

[Each motion is presented as a "yellow sticky" to the draft report.]

[JR Holt: Re Step 1: Move that the member raise his/her hand instead of stand up.]

STEP 2. Another member seconds the motion;

[Holt: I move the member clearly states his/her name when seconding a motion.]

STEP 3. The presiding officer restates the motion to the assembly;

STEP 4. The members discuss the motion;

STEP 5. Presiding officer asks for the affirmative votes & then the negative votes;

STEP 6. The presiding officer announces the result of the voting; instructs the corresponding officer to take action; and introduces the next item of business.

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Identify yourself when you make a motion using the "yellow sticky"
2. When you make a motion, refer to the line number on the printed Draft Report. You can also refer to the computer paragraph number.
3. When you second a motion, be sure that Linda gets your name for the official minutes.

PRACTICE AREA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

16

The Solid Waste Task Force (SWTF or task force) was appointed by the Board of Supervisors to work with county staff to review residential waste collection customer service and other issues that arose during the public hearing process for approval of the Solid Waste Management Plan. One of the recommendations of the plan was to have the County be more involved in oversight of residential waste collection. The Board removed that recommendation from the plan and appointed the SWTF "to resolve issues related to service quality, competition, air emissions from trucks, safety, disaster and emergency response, unified recycling activities and other issues that may be specified by the Board of Supervisors."

25

The SWTF in conjunction with county staff immediately organized their activities and began meeting monthly. The task force identified and categorized the issues and methodically worked through them using available technology to assist in the discussion, consensus building and preparation of this report.

29

Members of the task force met with waste collection companies to discuss the recommendations contained in this report. The proceedings of the task force were available to the community to review on a webpage specifically developed for the task force. Meeting locations, approved minutes, issues, recommendations, information materials, and the draft report have been available on the webpage and publicized to the collection companies and community members since the task force began its work.

35

The recommendations that follow are the result of research, dialog among the task force members, discussion with collection companies at their quarterly meetings, input from residents and community groups via email links from the webpage, and other sources who wished to comment. The recommendations in some cases validate work that was already done as part of the Solid Waste Management Plan process. The recommendations are the consensus of the SWTF.

Some recommendations may require additional work on the part of county staff or the collection companies. The SWTF believes that one of its strongest contributions to residential waste collection has been the increased emphasis or focus on enhancing communications between the companies, the county, and their customers. The operations of collection companies and county staff have been improved through discussions about procurement of services and the clarifications about the county's role in disaster operations and residential waste collection in general.

OTHER ITEMS (Group Outliner)

OTHER ITEMS

| **Presentation by Haulers: Conrad Mehan**

SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF FEBRUARY 22ND

Chapter 3 Customer Service

Overview of Customer Service Issues

442

Customer service is another of the categories of issues that the Solid Waste Task Force was asked to examine by the Board of Supervisors. A number of concerns identified during the development of the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and issues raised by collectors and members of the task force comprise the following discussion and recommendations.

447

The SWTF used a similar process for understanding customer service issues as it used for studying environmental ones. The task force researched information, asked questions of county staff, defined the issues, scrutinized current practices, and sought proposals and suggestions for improvements. Given the number and complexity of some of the issues, county staff recommended that the task force use the county's GroupSystems software and the Group Decision Support Center to examine customer service issues and develop recommendations that would improve customer service throughout the county.

PASSED

MOTION:Paul Liberty Second Sheila

Line 448 Substitute word "ones" to "matters".

PASSED

MOTION: Insert Hauler's Residential Solid Waste & Recycling here

LINE 455 ADD: The critical element in delivering good customer service is communication between the customer and their hauler coupled with a commitment of the hauler to meet or exceed their obligations. CONTINUE FROM HAULER HANDOUT..

NOTE: Include no list of haulers in the TF report.. List of haulers on County web site. Haulers' Document included in Appendix.

455

The task force explored the following issues and offer these recommendations.

Frequency - (level of service) (C-1)

457

Discussion. As defined by the task force, this issue considered whether all residents in the county have access to residential waste collectors who will provide the frequency of service required by the customers. After discussing the topic, the task force generally agreed there were sufficient private collectors to serve county residents and that most residents could choose the frequency of collection they want. Generally, the task force concluded that collectors should continue to offer whatever frequency their customers want.

PASSED:

Paul Liberty Second: Sheila

Line 459 delete word "generally"

PASSED

Motion:Paul Liberty Second Roit

Line 461 delete entire line starting with "Generally"

465

If some customers want to have more frequent service and are willing to pay for it, the task force did not want to come between businesses and their customers by dictating a required frequency of service for everyone. The county code (Chapter 109) clearly establishes a baseline for collection frequency of once a week collection for refuse and separate collection of recyclables. The task force did not want to recommend changing the code at this time.

PASSED

MOTION: Paul Liberty SECOND: Roit

Line 469 Remove "want to"

Recommendations (C-1)

474

C-1-1. No change in minimum frequency of once a week collection of residential waste and recyclables.

Missed Collections (C-2)

481

Discussion. Missed collections were a frequent service complaint heard by both county staff and Board members. Task force members discussed the impact of missed collections on customers and explored the reasons for missed collections, such as having the waste set out improperly or too late for the collection. Most members agreed that customers need to have missed collections corrected within 24 hours. The possibility of imposing fines on collectors who have large numbers of missed collections was considered.

WITHDRAWN

MOTION Joann Second Joan

Line 485: Corrected within 48 hours

PASSED

MOTION Doughty Second: Joyce B

Line 485: Replace "need" with "desire"

487

However, questions arose about what was an appropriate number or percentage of missed collections, who would collect and maintain the data needed to support a penalty system, what would the penalties be, how would they be enforced and others topics about implementing a penalty system for missed collections. The county does not currently have the resources to provide such services and some task force members did not want the county involved in imposing fines and penalties. Collection companies are already required by their permits to address their service levels with their customers and the companies could voluntarily expand on this communication with their customers to define their missed collection policy and any penalties or guarantees they wished to impose on themselves.

498

The task force further discussed the possible development of guidelines about missed collections. This could also be used as model contract language for community associations and residents contracting with collection companies for residential collection. Ultimately, the task force decided that providing such model contract language was not a function for county staff because the information could be obtained elsewhere.

505

The task force considered an idea of crafting a voluntary service level agreement or standard that collection companies would subscribe to and communicate to their customers. This conceptual agreement would state the service expectations and possibly penalties for noncompliance. Some of the components identified in the good customer service standard could include:

511

-- having someone answer the phone during operational hours.

PASSED

MOTION: Joann Second: Hasle

Line 511 or provide automated answering services

513

-- providing a phone message stating if collection operations are delayed or cancelled, so that customers could know the status of collections.

516

-- generally improving communications between the company and the customer.

518

-- picking up missed collections within 2 business days.

520

Task force members considered the idea of a county sponsored phone line for reporting and tracking of missed collections. However, the members determined that the expense and administrative questions made the phone line impractical to operate. Task force members used the Opinion Meter in GroupSystems to vote on several sub-issues about missed collections. In very close votes the task force agreed to:

PASSED

MOTION: Paul Liberty Second Sheila

Line 524 remove "In very close votes"

525

-- make a recommendation on missed collections

526

-- not to recommend having a county-sponsored phone line

527

-- ask each collector to have a phone line for their customers to report missed collections

529

-- ask collectors to respond to missed collections within one business day, a least a communication if not the full complaint resolution.

Recommendations (C-2)

534

C-2-1. Ask residential waste collectors to respond to missed collections within one business day, where response means communication with the customer but not necessarily resolution of the issue.

538

C-2-2. Ask each collector to set up a phone line for his or her customers to report missed collections.

PASSED

MOTION: Sheila Second Jim

Since c-2-2 is already in the code, remove this recommendation

WITHDRAWN

MOTION Joann Second:

"provide telephone service for customers" (not a dedicated line)

Competition (C-3)

544

Discussion. Competition among collection companies and the free market system are important principles supported by the task force. While members want to ensure that all residents have access to collection services, the task force believes the free market system will motivate collection companies to expand and offer services to areas that may be underserved. Specialized services to fill niche markets may be the new model for residential waste collection. The free market system and competition will drive service levels and help ensure that companies providing good service will prosper while those that do not will see their market share diminish. County residents have access to a variety of service options, such as: county collection in a sanitary district, hiring a private collection company, or taking their trash to a citizens disposal facility. Informed customers will choose the service that best meets their needs.

NOT PASSED

MOTION: Joann Second: Joan

Line 551: County residents have access to a variety of service options. Delete rest of sentence.

PASSED

MOTION: Bill Second Sheila

Insert at 555: One of the factors contributing to competitive marketplace is the county's operation of facilities....Recommendation that the county continue own or control and operate these disposal facilities.

555

Information about the availability of collection companies, services provided, and contact numbers is maintained on the county's website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/trash/disphaulers.htm. The exact zip code areas served by private collectors can be found by calling the county's solid waste program at 703-324-5230.

COMMUNICATIONS PASSED

MOTION: Bill Second: Sheila

Delete all after 556: web site to end of 559

Note: Relocate this info to keep all communication discussion in that section of rpt.

NOTE:

County does not always know each company's exact service area so we might not know the exact zip code. from staff

560

The task force cannot make additional recommendations that will ensure all residents have access to services, but competition should encourage collectors to move into areas where business opportunities arise.

PASSED (2 Nos)

MOTION: Sheila Second: Joyce

Change 560: The Task Force reviewed many options for solid waste collection within the County, including the option of the county assuming responsibility for contracting services for all county residents. After lengthy discussions, it was determined that the current free market system, with competition among haulers, provides residents with the best prospect for multiple options for collection services.

EDITORIAL ACTION:

MOTION: Joann Second: Joan

Line 560, AMEND motion above after "for all county residents." sentence to read: "which was rejected by the task force." Note: Editors, please correct this sentence.

REMOVE THIS:

MOTION: Bill Second Joann

Line 560: Remove "cannot" insert "The task force discussed at length the option of the county assuming responsibility for contracting services for all county residents. This option was rejected by the task force. Additional recommendations will not ensure that all residents have access to all service options or all companies serving Fairfax County, but competition should encourage... arise. "

PASSED

MOTION: Sheila Second: Joyce D

Do not have a stand alone "recommendation" when the recommendation is to not recommend anything.

Recommendations (C-3)

564

C-3-1. No additional recommendation concerning competition since there are various collection companies that serve the county.

Weight of collection containers (C-4)

568

Discussion. This issue arises from the public concern voiced during the preparation of the Solid Waste Management Plan about the weight of trash containers that collection company employees must lift. The county code (Chapter 109) provides an upper limit of 50 pounds per container that can be collected. After a thorough discussion of the various concerns about the weight of collection containers, from the collectors and customers' perspectives, the task force agreed that there should be no recommendation to change the criteria at this time. The amount of waste that companies are willing to allow their workers to collect is a business decision and one that should be communicated to their customers.

PASSED

MOTION: Clark Second: Bill

line 573 delete "there should be no recommendation" add instead "it was not appropriate" - tyler

Recommendations (C-4)

579

C-4-1. No additional recommendation concerning weight of containers since the upper limit weight of containers is adequately addressed in the county code (Chapter 109).

PASSED

MOTION: Joyce Second: Joyce

DELETE 579

Size and volume of brush (C-5)

582

Discussion. The exact definition of brush constituted part of the initial discussion of this issue. The discussion also related that there needs to be a clear definition of brush in the county code (Chapter 109). County code requires recycling of brush, as the material is collected separately and taken to processing facilities where it is ground for mulch. Collectors felt that brush is not the result of a tree removal, but consists of sticks, twigs and branches that result from normal pruning of household trees and bushes.

[Paul Liberty

Line 592 Remove entire line starting with "Several task force" - repetitive to 586]

TABLED

MOTION: Conrad Second: Bill

Add as first sentence:

Brush collection is a separate service from yard waste. Both services require clarification as to what the haulers can and will provide.

NOTE (no motion): Brush should include material not only from "normal pruning" but also "vegetation that falls to the ground as part of the plant's normal life cycle". from staff

587

If the material results from a tree removal, then the resulting woody debris should be handled by the tree service or as a special collection for which the collectors could charge extra.

Large amounts of brush should not be part of the regular trash collection. For purposes of the recommendation, the task force defined brush as woody waste that results from pruning of trees, sticks, and twigs. Several task force members stated that brush should not include small landscape bushes, lawn trimmings, or leaves.

[Paul Liberty

Line 593 Remove line starting "Several task force"]

595

The size of brush to be collected is an issue in terms of the physical length, diameter, weight, and total volume that can and should be collected as part of household trash. If brush is too large it could jam the collection truck's compaction system. Brush needs to be cut to a size that can be handled safely, efficiently, and effectively.

600

Collectors have a responsibility to define brush collection criteria to their customers and address how it should be prepared for collection. Collectors should define the maximum volume of brush to be collected as well as establish their prices for special collections.

605

Several votes were taken using the GroupSystems software to determine what, if any, recommendations should be made about the size and volume of brush to be collected. In very close votes, task force members agreed that the collectors operating in the county should continue to be required to pick up brush as a regular residential waste collection and that collection should follow the requirements in the county code, Chapter 109.

[Paul Liberty]

Line 607 Remove "In very close votes"]

Recommendations (C-5)

614

C-5-1. Change Chapter 109 to clearly define brush. The task force recommends that the definition include that brush is woody waste that results from normal household pruning of trees, sticks and twigs. Brush to be collected should be no longer than 4 feet in length, no greater than 6 inches in diameter, with no individual piece or bundle weighing more than 50 pounds.

[Conrad: Add additional recommendation:

Task Force recommends that the haulers and County Solid Waste staff work together to develop guidelines for yard waste collections; specifically, to address the following issues:

1. Improving.....

2. Identifying

3. Protecting....

4. Developing.....]

[Paul Liberty]

Disagree with Conrad's discussion to insert the February 15th memo from John Hasle to Bill Lecos regarding 1. Improving 2. Identifying]

[Paul Liberty]

Continuing on with the Conrad suggestion - - 3. Protecting 4. Developing

This was discussed in great detail and recommendations were made or not made accordingly.]

WASTE / BRUSH TO DO:

MOTION: Bill Second:?

Line 614: Change to "Change Chapter 109 to clearly distinguish between brush and yard waste.

620

C-5-2. The volume of brush to be collected should remain as it is currently stated in county code (Chapter 109).

(NOTE: The County Code currently differentiates between once a week and twice weekly collection in terms of how much brush is the minimum amount that will be collected.)

626

C-5-3. Christmas trees remain exempt from the size limitations for brush collection.

Rate increase amounts should be included in rate increase announcements (C-6)

630

Discussion. The notice of a rate increase must be given at least 30 days prior to implementing the increase per county code (Chapter 109). The code does not require the specific amount of the increase be included in the notice. The task force conducted a thorough discussion from various perspectives about whether rate increase notices should include the actual rate increase amount. Most members felt that if the collection company provided the notice of a rate increase 30 days prior to implementing it, then the company had met its requirement. Possibly as a customer service expectation, collectors could agree to simply include the amount of the increase. However, the task force did not feel strongly enough about this issue to require that the county code be changed.

PASSED (12 ayes)

MOTION: Doughty Second: Paul

Delete from sentence "Most members felt" to end.

Replace with - The task force recommends that collection companies provide notice of a rate increase 30 days prior to implementing it, such notice to include the amount of the increase.

PASSED but overtaken by previous motion

MOTION: Paul Liberty Second: Phil

Line 637 Remove "However"

Line 638 Substitutue "did not feel strongly enough about this issue to require that" with "determined that no change to"

Line 639 Remove "changed" to "was necessary"

Recommendations (C-6)

643

C-6-1. No recommendation at this time. As a good business practice, collectors will probably want to include the amount in their rate increase notices.

PASSED

MOTION: Sheila Second: Joann

C-6-1. The task force recommends that the code be changed to require collection companies to include the amount when providing notice of a rate increase 30 days prior to implementing it. Roit

Safety issues (traffic congestion, zig-zagging on streets) (C-7)

648

Discussion. Task force members engaged in a comprehensive discussion of the various safety issues involved with multiple trucks collecting waste on residential streets. Topics included trucks zigzagging across streets to collect on both sides of neighborhood streets and speeding in neighborhoods. While these are important safety concerns, most task force members thought the resolution of these problems was beyond the scope of the task force and rested with law enforcement. Collection companies could voluntarily agree to operate safely as part of the good customer service agreement or standard that is being developed in conjunction with this task force.

PASSED

Motion: Paul Liberty Second: Conrad

Line 646 Change header by removing "zig-zagging on streets" and replacing with "unsafe driving"

NOT PASSED

MOTION: Queenie No Second

Task force recommend that citizens

I don't believe "these problems [are] beyond the scope of the task force." I feel the task force should at a minimum recommend that residents who witness these safety infringements to obtain vehicle identification information and report the incident to both the company and send the offender a "special" police notification that was implemented in Fairfax County awhile ago.

Recommendations (C-7)

660

C-7-1. No recommendation concerning residential waste collection safety issues since most are related to law enforcement matters and, while very important, no separate recommendation is necessary.

PASSED

MOTION: Roit Second: ?

Remove lines 658-662 (Roit)

Extra charges for special collections (C-8)

665

Discussion. The task force examined the definition of special collections and became convinced that what constitutes special collections varies significantly among collection companies. Most collectors charge separately for bulky items or large volumes of waste that are considered special collections, unless covered as part of a community contract. The task force agreed that whether to charge for special collections is a matter for determination in the contract between the collection companies and their customers. The county code (Chapter 109) allows collection companies to charge separately for special collections.

PASSED:: Editorial change

Paul Liberty

Line 665 Replace "became convinced" with "determined"

Recommendations (C-8)

675

C-8-1. No recommendation will be made about extra charges for special collections. The county code already allows collection companies to charge a fee for specials and the amount to be charged is a business decision not something that the code should establish.

PASSED

MOTION: Roit Second Joyce

delete Line 673 - 678

Contracting with collectors (C-9)

681

Discussion: Some task force members stated there was limited information available to homeowner associations (HOAs) and communities about how to contract for the collection of waste. Other members suggested that there were private associations such as Community Association Institute (CAI) that could advise HOAs about drafting solicitations and contracts for their communities. Also the county publishes the Fairfax County Community Associations Manual that contains information about developing contracts for solid waste collection and recycling services. The manual is available at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dtcs/consserv/.htm.

690

It was agreed by the task force that it would be advisable for associations and communities to have this information, but most members questioned the need for developing additional resources since most of the information is already available through the county's webpage. After a discussion of the issues, members voted narrowly to recommend that county staff not be asked to draft further

information about contracting with collectors. The task force wanted to leave this as an issue to be developed between collection companies and their customers.

COMMUNICATIONS: PASSED

MOTION: Clark Second: Bill

Remove 681 through 696 and move to Communication

Recommendations (C-9)

700

C-9-1. No further recommendation will be made to develop additional information about contracting with collectors.

MOTION: Joyce D Second Joan Carr

Delete 698 - 701

Strategy for emergencies (C-10)

704

Discussion: This issue concerns how private residential waste collection companies could and should be involved to help clean up debris and waste during an emergency, disaster or weather event. Many members thought it was difficult to focus on recommendations since there were questions about what constituted an emergency--declared and undeclared emergencies or disasters, the type of emergencies (weather, natural, man-made, terrorists), whether the County would pay collectors for their services, whether to lift restrictions for collectors during these emergencies, and many others.

713

The task force agreed that garbage and trash related to health and safety issues should be removed and disposed quickly by the regular trash services during emergencies. The collectors stated that brush removal and recycling should not be a priority in a widespread disaster. Others thought brush was the main problem in many weather related disasters. Collectors on the task force countered that they are not tree companies and are not equipped to handle amounts of brush significantly above county code requirements.

721

Some collector representatives on the task force stated collectors already view emergencies from the community-wide perspective and will support their customers to the extent of their equipment and resources. However, the representatives stated the county could accommodate them by relaxing restrictions, increasing operating hours, or lowering tip fees during unplanned events. County staff responded that lowering tip fees during such emergencies was not feasible since disposal facilities are external to the county and charge for their services. However, extended operating hours did occur during recent storm related emergencies at county controlled facilities.

730

There are many issues about debris removal that are not trash issues. When a state of emergency is declared, collectors need to know what to do to help the community recover from the event. Collectors suggested that perhaps recycling and brush collection activities could be deferred until the emergency had passed.

735

The county should take the lead during a declared emergency to coordinate cleanup efforts since the county's Emergency Management Plan describes how the county will operate during various types of emergencies. County staff will have a debris removal coordinator, who can keep collectors informed and work with them to maximize overall collection efforts. Collectors should be familiar with the emergency procedures to include the collectors in various emergency/disaster responses prior to emergencies. It was the sense of the task force that the county should be the central coordination and communication conduit for declared and undeclared emergencies.

EMERGENCY PARKING LOT:

MOTION: Joyce Second: ?

Move paragraph 735 to 742 and move to beginning of section.

It is the consensus of the task force that the county plays a critical role in the delivery of services during emergencies.

Add : There are other services involved in addition to solid waste (e.g., hazmat.etc/)

744

County staff would like to develop a mechanism for collectors to be available, as needed and on a voluntary basis, to help in a coordinated cleanup effort. Collectors could provide whatever additional capacity they had after serving their customers to help with general community cleanup work. If collectors were used during emergencies and weather events, they wanted to have a mechanism to receive compensation for their efforts. The collectors on the task force wanted to provide trash services but state they are generally not equipped to provide tree or construction/demolition/debris removal services.

753

Members of the task force attended a quarterly collectors meeting in January 2005, to discuss this issue and heard collectors state they are willing to help county staff provide for community cleanup, if they have the excess capacity after serving their customers and if they are paid for their efforts.

Recommendations (C-10)

759

(To be developed by the task force)

County's role in Customer Service (C-11)

762

Discussion. Resolution of what was perceived as poor service in residential waste collection was a major issue to be addressed by the SWTF. What should be the county's role with respect to customer service? Access to county staff and the Board of Supervisors will always be a way for residents to air their customer service complaints. It is the desire that customer service issues be resolved by the collection companies without other intervention. This can be accomplished by having a greater customer service awareness by companies, including the development of customer service standards and being accessible and responsive to their customers. There will be a continuing role for the county in resolving communications, environmental, customer service, and operations issues. However, the task force agreed that the county is not expected to become the customer service interface between collection companies and their customers. The county's role in regulatory enforcement will continue.

TABLED UNTIL COMMUNICATION:

Conrad mehan: add to last line:

"The County should assist the general public by providing information about haulers' 'Quality Customer Service Standards.' The County should make user friendly enhancements to its website to further educate the public as to the services it provides.

EDITORIAL CHANGE

Paul Liberty

Line 766 Substitutue "The task force agreed" for "It is the desire"

Line 766 insert "should" between words "issues" and "be"

Recommendations (C-11)

775

C-11-1. Not further recommendation for changing the county's role in customer service

MOVE TO COMMUNICATIONS

Conrad suggests that:

The Task Force ask the Board of Supervisors to:

A.change County's home page to its website to include a separate subject heading titled "Trash & Recycling".

B. The Solid Waste division's web page should be changed to include a link to

1. 'Quality Customer Service Standards'

2.. websites of those haulers who request to be linked to the County site.

PASSED

MOTION: Sheila Second: Marilyn

Remove lines 774-775 (Roit)

Communication (C-12)

PULL OUT AND PARK:

Replace as separate section in report from LINE 777 to 809

778

Discussion. Communication is critical to the three categories of issues discussed by the task force in this report. Communication underpins and supports the successful resolution of many of these issues. Many of the customer service and operations issues are directly attributable to a lack of communication between collectors and their customers or a misunderstanding of expectations. The task force considered developing a separate chapter about communication, but decided to simply note that communications were important in resolving all the other issues. Specific recommendations for other issues will encompass communications strategies as appropriate.

[Paul Liberty

Line 781 add words "and the county and collectors" between words "collectors" and "and"

Line 782 delete "or a misunderstanding of expectations"

Line 784 insert "establishing expectations and" between words "in" and "resolving"]

787

Communication is important to most interactions between collectors and their customers. The county code requires that collectors have a way for customers to contact them during business hours. In general, the task force discussed several good customer service standards for communication frequency and content.

[Paul Liberty

Line 789 insert words "models for" between words "several" and "good"]

791

-- collectors would communicate with their customers at least annually addressing their services, expectations, how to dispose and recycle correctly, and other topics.

794

-- collectors would response to missed collections or other customer service calls within 1 business day.

796

-- collectors would include the amount of price increases with the required notice of a planned price increase at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the increase.

799

At a collection company quarterly meeting in January 2005, county staff explained about a new emergency alert system that could be used by collectors to keep them informed about weather and other events that activate the alert system. The system is voluntary and collectors can easily subscribe to it. In anticipation of a weather event or the occurrence of an event that activates the alert system, a message is sent to all subscribers. This system could improve the communications between collectors and county staff. The decision will be left with the collectors as to whether they choose to subscribe to the county's emergency alert system.

Recommendations (C-12)

808

TBD

Service Level Agreement (C-13)

811

Discussion. As defined by the task force, a service level agreement is a set of customer service standards that the collection companies would provide to their customers. The agreement is variously referred to as a good customer service statement, a customer service creed or a standard for service. Whatever it is named, the agreement would be a voluntary set of standards that collectors would subscribe to when communicating their services to customers. The customers could rely on the standards to define their expectations for good customer service when selecting a collection company.

EDITORIAL CHANGES

Paul Liberty

Line 814 Delete " Whatever it is named"

Line 815 Substitutue word "subscribe" to "agree"

WITHDRAWN

MOTION Joyce B Second: Paul

line 822: Delete "One task force member agreed...." and rewrite

PASSED

MOTION: Sheila Second: Paul

Change line 822 to: "A subcommitte of the task force met with the Haulers to create draft customer srvice"

820

Several members agreed there was value for collectors to create a voluntary charter for customer service that would describe how collection services would be provided to customers. One task force member agreed to create a draft customer service document and worked with other collection companies and staff to create an initial version of a customer service agreement. Staff mailed each collection company a copy of the draft to allow all collection companies to become familiar with the document and its concepts. The task force then facilitated a meeting on February 9, 2005, where all collection firms operating in Fairfax County were invited to attend to discuss the draft. Nine collectors, along with county staff, participated in the discussion that was held at the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce.

830

These discussions were fruitful and resulted in the good customer service standard that is attached at Appendix____. Additional guidelines about the standards are also part of the appendix and located on the county's website. Collectors who subscribe to the standards will be listed separately on the county website. Customers in the county will benefit from this concise statement of service levels and expectations that describe how residential waste collection services will be provided in the county. This statement will be distributed by collectors to their customers.

837

The hauling companies at the February 9 meeting also discussed the fragile nature of a voluntary customer service standard, and discussed possible methods of reporting and tracking company satisfaction. No method was selected

Recommendations (C-13)

842

C-13-1. Collection companies are encouraged to actively follow the good customer service standards and use the document in co